THE THIRD CENTURY CRISIS: ROME'S MILITARY ANARCHY AND THE VALIDATION OF THE CHAOS THESIS

A Case Study in Elite Fragmentation and Provincial Secession (235-284 CE)

Thomas J. Bryan and Claude (Anthropic)

INTRODUCTION: WHEN THE ETERNAL CITY FRACTURED

For nearly two and a half centuries following the death of Augustus in 14 CE, the Roman Empire maintained a remarkable degree of stability and territorial integrity. The Pax Romana, however imperfect in practice, represented a genuine achievement in creating a unified political order across the Mediterranean world and beyond. Provincial uprisings occurred, certainly, but they were systematically suppressed by a centralized imperial administration commanding professional legions loyal to Rome. The violence monopoly functioned effectively, and elite coordination, while sometimes strained, remained sufficient to crush challenges to imperial authority.

Then, in 235 CE, Emperor Severus Alexander was assassinated by his own troops following a failed campaign against Germanic tribes on the Rhine frontier. What followed was not merely a succession crisis or a brief period of civil war, but rather a fifty-year descent into what historians call the Crisis of the Third Century or the Military Anarchy. Between 235 and 284 CE, at least fifty different individuals claimed the imperial title, with only about half achieving recognition by the Senate as legitimate emperors. The average reign lasted less than two years. Most emperors died violently, assassinated by their own troops or killed in battle against rival claimants. The Roman state, which had successfully suppressed provincial revolts for generations, splintered into three competing empires. Peasant rebellions erupted in provinces that had been peaceful for centuries. The violence monopoly fragmented, elite coordination collapsed, and opportunities emerged for challenges to imperial authority that would have been unthinkable under normal conditions.

The Third Century Crisis provides one of the clearest historical demonstrations of the Chaos Thesis outside the modern revolutionary periods examined in previous case studies. It shows with remarkable clarity how elite fragmentation creates windows of opportunity for provincial secession and popular rebellion, and how the restoration of elite coordination enables rapid reconquest and suppression. The pattern validates the core argument: revolutionary and secessionist success depends not primarily on the strength or organization of revolutionary movements themselves, but rather on the degree of chaos and fragmentation among ruling elites.

This case study examines three distinct but interrelated phenomena during the Crisis: first, the elite fragmentation that characterized the period of military anarchy; second, the successful provincial secessions that created the Gallic Empire and the Palmyrene Empire; and third, the peasant rebellions known as the Bagaudae. Each demonstrates how opportunities for rebellion and secession correlate directly with elite dysfunction, and how restoration of elite coordination enables systematic suppression.

PART I: THE COLLAPSE OF ELITE COORDINATION

The Severan Dynasty and the Seeds of Crisis

The roots of the Third Century Crisis lay in developments during the Severan Dynasty that preceded it. Septimius Severus, who founded the dynasty after prevailing in a civil war following the murder of Commodus in 192 CE, fundamentally altered the relationship between the emperor and the military. Recognizing that imperial power rested ultimately on military force, Severus increased legionary pay from three hundred to five hundred denarii annually and expanded the army by approximately one quarter. These measures were intended to secure military loyalty, but they established a dangerous precedent and created severe fiscal pressures.

Severus's deathbed advice to his sons, as recorded by ancient historians, was stark in its cynicism: "Enrich the soldiers and despise everyone else." This represented a significant shift in the paradigm of imperial power. While previous emperors had always relied on military support to some degree, the Severan approach made imperial authority explicitly dependent on the army's continued satisfaction with material rewards. The position of emperor, which had maintained at least the facade of drawing legitimacy from the Senate and the Roman people, became increasingly a transaction between military commanders and their troops.

The fiscal consequences of Severan military policy were profound. Maintaining larger armies at higher pay required increased revenues, but the empire's capacity for territorial expansion had largely ended. The flow of tribute and spoils from conquest, which had helped finance earlier military expenditures, had slowed considerably by the third century. To meet military payrolls, the Severan emperors began debasing the currency, reducing the precious metal content of coins while maintaining their face value. This initial debasement did not immediately cause

economic crisis, but it established a pattern that later emperors would follow with increasingly severe consequences.

More fundamentally, the Severan focus on military loyalty at the expense of other constituencies weakened the traditional bases of imperial legitimacy. The Senate's role in confirming emperors, while never more than partially effective, became increasingly irrelevant. Provincial elites who had provided crucial support for imperial administration found their interests subordinated to military demands. The empire's political culture shifted toward a model in which emperors were essentially military commanders whose authority derived from their ability to satisfy and control armed forces, not from any broader political or constitutional foundation.

The Assassination and Its Aftermath

When Severus Alexander assumed power in 222 CE at age thirteen, he inherited an empire strained by the Severan military policies but still fundamentally intact. His assassination thirteen years later marked the beginning of systemic collapse. The circumstances of his death revealed the fragility of imperial authority in the new paradigm. Leading troops against Germanic tribes raiding across the Rhine, Severus Alexander reportedly resorted to diplomacy and paying tribute to pacify the invaders quickly rather than pursuing military conquest. According to the historian Herodian, this approach cost him the respect of his troops, who felt that tribes intruding on Roman territory deserved punishment, not negotiation.

The assassination itself was carried out by soldiers of his own legions, who proclaimed their commander Maximinus Thrax as emperor. This moment marked a critical threshold. Maximinus was the first of what historians call the "barracks emperors"—military commanders elevated to imperial power by their troops without senatorial approval, distinguished ancestry, hereditary claim, or significant political experience. His elevation established a pattern that would dominate the next half-century: emperors chosen by armies based on their perceived military competence and generosity toward troops, vulnerable to assassination the moment they disappointed military expectations.

The Year of the Six Emperors in 238 CE demonstrated how thoroughly the old political order had disintegrated. When the Senate, displeased at being forced to accept a Thracian peasant as emperor, supported a revolt in Africa led by Gordian I and his son Gordian II, Maximinus responded with military force. The Gordians were quickly defeated, with Gordian II killed in battle and Gordian I committing suicide. The Senate then elevated two of their own members, Pupienus and Balbinus, as co-emperors, with Gordian I's grandson Gordian III designated as Caesar. Maximinus marched on Rome but was assassinated by his own troops before reaching the city. The Praetorian Guard then murdered both Pupienus and Balbinus, leaving the teenage Gordian III as sole emperor.

This rapid succession of violent deaths was not an aberration but rather the new normal. The Crisis saw a continuous cycle in which military commanders proclaimed themselves emperor, ruled briefly while fighting rival claimants and external enemies, and were then assassinated by their own troops or killed in civil wars. Gordian III ruled for six years before dying under unclear

circumstances during a Persian campaign in 244 CE. Philip the Arab ruled for five years before being killed in battle against the usurper Decius in 249 CE. Decius himself died in battle against the Goths in 251 CE. Gallienus, who managed to hold power from 253 to 268 CE—an exceptionally long reign for the period—faced constant usurpations and was eventually assassinated in a military coup.

The Mechanics of Elite Fragmentation

The pattern of rapid imperial turnover created destructive dynamics that systematically weakened the empire's capacity to respond to challenges. Each time a new emperor seized power, he needed to secure military loyalty quickly. The traditional method was an "accession bonus"—a substantial payment to the troops who had elevated him. This required immediate access to funds, which emperors typically obtained by debasing the currency further, minting more coins with less precious metal content. Over time, this produced severe inflation that undermined economic stability and made it even more difficult for subsequent emperors to satisfy military demands.

The requirement to constantly fight rivals meant that emperors could not focus sustained attention on defending the empire's frontiers or maintaining provincial administration. Legions that should have been stationed on the borders defending against external enemies were instead deployed in civil wars against other Roman armies. Generals who should have been coordinating defensive strategies were instead competing to proclaim their commanders as emperor. The institutional capacity for centralized coordination that had characterized the High Empire simply ceased to function effectively.

The fragmentation was not merely political but also geographical. Provincial armies increasingly acted independently, proclaiming their own commanders as emperor and fighting to establish regional power bases. Between 260 and 262 CE, the empire saw simultaneous usurpers in Africa, Germania, Gaul, and the East. This was not a coordinated rebellion against central authority but rather multiple competing attempts to seize that authority. The violence monopoly had not been destroyed but rather had fragmented into competing monopolies, each controlled by a different military commander with aspirations to imperial power.

Elite coordination collapsed not only between different military factions but also between the military and civilian administrative apparatus. The Senate, which had traditionally played some role in confirming emperors and providing legitimacy, became increasingly irrelevant. Provincial governors and administrators found themselves caught between competing imperial claimants, forced to choose sides in civil wars without clear guidance about which faction would ultimately prevail. The sophisticated administrative systems that had enabled effective governance across the vast empire depended on clear lines of authority and reliable chains of command. When those systems broke down, provincial administration became haphazard and ineffective.

The fiscal crisis compounded all other problems. Constant warfare required constant expenditure, but the economic disruption caused by civil wars and external invasions reduced tax revenues. The debasement of currency produced inflation that made money increasingly

worthless, pushing the economy toward barter systems that were difficult for the central government to tax. Cities that had thrived under the Pax Romana found their trade networks disrupted by insecurity on roads and sea lanes. Agricultural production declined in regions affected by warfare. The economic foundation that had supported Roman power was systematically eroding.

External enemies recognized and exploited Roman weakness. Germanic tribes that had previously been contained or intimidated by Roman military power began large-scale invasions. Smaller Germanic groups had coalesced into larger tribal confederations capable of organizing substantial military campaigns. The Alamanni, Franks, Goths, Vandals, and other groups raided across the Rhine and Danube frontiers, penetrating deep into imperial territory. Cities that had not needed fortifications for centuries began building defensive walls. In the East, the Sassanid Persian Empire, which had overthrown the Parthian dynasty in the 220s, proved far more aggressive and effective than the Parthians had been. Sassanid forces invaded Roman territory repeatedly, achieving victories that had been rare in previous centuries.

The cumulative effect was a crisis of legitimacy. The emperor's authority had traditionally rested on a combination of military power, administrative effectiveness, and ideological claims about preserving Roman order and protecting Roman territory. When emperors could not effectively defend the frontiers, could not maintain economic stability, and spent most of their energy fighting other Roman armies, the basis for their legitimacy eroded. Provincial populations faced a choice between supporting a distant emperor who could not protect them or seeking alternative arrangements. It was in this context of complete elite dysfunction that opportunities emerged for both provincial secession and popular rebellion.

PART II: THE PROVINCIAL BREAKAWAYS

The Gallic Empire: Elite Secession in the West

The creation of the Gallic Empire in 260 CE represented the most dramatic demonstration of how elite fragmentation enabled provincial secession that would have been impossible under normal conditions. The immediate catalyst was the capture of Emperor Valerian by the Sassanid Persian king Shapur I in the Battle of Edessa. This was unprecedented in Roman history—no emperor had ever been taken alive by enemy forces. Valerian's son and co-emperor Gallienus found himself ruling alone, facing simultaneous crises on multiple frontiers with insufficient forces to address any of them adequately.

In the chaotic aftermath of Valerian's capture, Postumus, who served as governor of Upper and Lower Germania, declared himself emperor. He had successfully defended the Rhine frontier against Frankish invasions and enjoyed support from both his legions and the Gallic provincial elites who saw him as their protector. After defeating and killing Saloninus, the son of Gallienus

who had been left in Gaul, Postumus established what historians call the Gallic Empire, which at its height controlled Germania, Gaul, Britannia, and parts of Hispania.

What is remarkable about the Gallic Empire is that it was not framed as a rebellion against Rome but rather as a Roman solution to Roman problems. Postumus did not claim to be overthrowing Roman authority but rather exercising it more effectively than the emperor in Italy could. He established a capital at Cologne and later Trier, complete with imperial court, Senate, and Praetorian Guard. He minted coins that depicted him using traditional Roman imperial imagery and titles. His administration maintained Roman laws, Roman administrative structures, and Roman military organization. This was not a barbarian kingdom or an anti-Roman revolt but rather a claim that the western provinces could and should govern themselves as a Roman empire because the central government had failed to protect them.

The success of the Gallic Empire depended entirely on the inability of the central Roman government to respond effectively. Gallienus recognized Postumus as a usurper and declared war, but he could not concentrate sufficient forces against Gaul while simultaneously fighting external enemies and other usurpers. The violence monopoly that would normally have been deployed to crush provincial secession was unavailable because it was fragmented and scattered across multiple fronts. When Gallienus did campaign against Postumus in the mid-260s, the efforts were inconclusive and had to be abandoned as new crises emerged elsewhere.

Postumus ruled the Gallic Empire for nearly a decade, from 260 to 269 CE. His reign was relatively stable and successful by the standards of the period. He defended the Rhine frontier effectively, maintaining security that the central government could not provide. The Gallic provinces under his rule experienced less disruption than those that remained under the nominal control of emperors fighting constant civil wars in Italy. This demonstrates a crucial point about elite secession during chaos: Postumus offered Gallic elites and populations something they valued—effective defense and relative stability—that the fragmented central authority could not deliver.

The end of Postumus's reign illustrated the same dynamics that plagued the central empire. After defeating a usurper named Laelianus in 269 CE, Postumus forbade his troops from sacking the city of Mainz. Angered by this denial of plunder, his soldiers assassinated him. This pattern—military commanders elevated by their troops, then killed by them when they disappointed military expectations—was not unique to the Gallic Empire but rather reflected the broader crisis of military-based power.

Postumus's successors faced increasing pressure from both barbarian invasions and the central Roman government. Victorinus ruled from 269 to 271, spending most of his reign fighting insurgencies and attempting to recover territories that had realigned with Rome under Claudius Gothicus. He too was assassinated. Tetricus I, who ruled from 271 to 274, faced both Germanic invasions and the determined reconquest efforts of Emperor Aurelian. The Gallic Empire ended in 274 CE at the Battle of Châlons, where Tetricus was defeated and the western provinces were reintegrated into the Roman Empire.

What enabled this reintegration was not that the Gallic Empire had become weaker but rather that Roman elite coordination had been partially restored under Aurelian. With a strong emperor who could concentrate military forces and deploy them effectively, the same provinces that had successfully seceded during maximum elite chaos were reconquered relatively quickly. The fourteen-year existence of an independent Gallic Empire, governing Roman provinces as a separate Roman state, was made possible entirely by the fragmentation of central authority. When that fragmentation was reduced, the secession could no longer be sustained.

The Palmyrene Empire: Elite Opportunism in the East

While the Gallic Empire emerged in the west, a parallel secession occurred in the east under remarkably similar circumstances. The city of Palmyra, located in the Syrian desert, had grown wealthy as a caravan hub connecting Roman and Persian trade networks. Under the leadership of Odaenathus, a member of Palmyra's ruling elite, the city had gained significant military and political power. When Emperor Valerian was captured by the Persians in 260 CE, Odaenathus assembled an army of Palmyrene forces and Syrian peasants to attack the Sassanid forces. His victories against both the Persians and usurpers in the eastern provinces led Gallienus to grant him the title "Governor of the East," effectively delegating imperial authority over the region.

Odaenathus maintained nominal loyalty to Gallienus while operating with de facto independence. He controlled Syria, declared himself "King of Kings" using eastern royal titles, and commanded substantial military forces. His assassination in 267 CE, allegedly by a cousin, created a succession crisis in Palmyra that resulted in power passing to his widow Zenobia, ruling as regent for their son Vaballathus, who was approximately ten years old.

Zenobia's ambitions exceeded her husband's careful balancing act. In 270 CE, a Palmyrene army of seventy thousand invaded and conquered Egypt, one of the empire's wealthiest provinces. The Roman general defending Egypt was defeated and committed suicide after being besieged. Zenobia then expanded Palmyrene control into Asia Minor, conquering Galatia and occupying Ancyra. At its greatest extent, the Palmyrene Empire controlled Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and large portions of Asia Minor.

Like Postumus in the west, Zenobia initially maintained a pretense of acting on Rome's behalf. She issued coins in the name of Emperor Aurelian depicting Vaballathus as king while acknowledging Aurelian as emperor. This diplomatic fiction allowed her to consolidate power while avoiding open confrontation with Rome. It also reflected a pragmatic recognition that even a weakened Roman Empire could still pose a serious threat if it could concentrate its forces.

The pretense of subordination to Rome ended in 271 CE when Zenobia claimed the imperial title for both herself and her son. This was a direct challenge to Roman authority, but the timing was calculated. Aurelian had only recently become emperor and was still consolidating his power. The expectation was that, like previous emperors during the Crisis, he would be too distracted by other problems to respond effectively to eastern secession.

This calculation proved incorrect. Aurelian, unlike many of his predecessors, was able to establish sufficient control over the military and sufficient elite coordination to launch a concentrated campaign of reconquest. In 272 CE, he led a military expedition against Palmyra, defeating Zenobia's forces at the Battle of Immae and then again at the Battle of Emesa. Zenobia fled toward Persia to seek aid but was captured. Aurelian besieged Palmyra and forced its surrender.

The rapidity of Palmyra's fall demonstrated the same pattern seen in the reconquest of the Gallic Empire. The Palmyrene Empire had not fundamentally weakened between its zenith in 271 and its defeat in 272. What changed was that Roman elite coordination had been partially restored under Aurelian, enabling the deployment of concentrated military force. The five years during which Palmyra exercised de facto independence, and the brief period of explicit imperial claims, were made possible by Roman elite chaos. When that chaos was reduced, the secession was crushed quickly.

A Palmyrene rebellion in 273 CE led Aurelian to raze the city, demonstrating both the restored capacity for systematic suppression and the determination to prevent future challenges. The destruction of Palmyra sent a clear message about the costs of provincial secession. Yet the message was only credible because elite coordination had been sufficiently restored to enable such decisive action. During the period of maximum elite fragmentation, such suppression would have been impossible.

The Pattern of Elite Secession

Both the Gallic Empire and the Palmyrene Empire demonstrate several crucial patterns that validate the Chaos Thesis. First, both secessions succeeded not because of revolutionary popular movements or anti-Roman ideology but because Roman elite were too fragmented to respond effectively. Postumus and Zenobia were themselves members of provincial elites operating within Roman political and cultural frameworks. They claimed to be exercising Roman authority, not rejecting it.

Second, both secessions were framed initially as providing better governance and security than the central administration could deliver. This was not merely propaganda. The Gallic Empire under Postumus did defend the Rhine frontier more effectively than a distracted central government could have. Palmyra under Odaenathus and Zenobia did protect the eastern provinces from Persian invasions that Roman forces had failed to prevent. The secessions succeeded partly because they offered provincial populations something valuable that the fragmented central authority could not provide.

Third, both secessions maintained Roman administrative structures, legal systems, and cultural forms. The Gallic emperors minted coins with Roman imagery, maintained a Senate, and governed through Roman institutional frameworks. Zenobia issued coins acknowledging Roman emperors even while exercising independent power. This was not a rejection of Roman civilization but rather a claim to represent it better than the chaos-ridden central government.

Fourth, both secessions ended quickly once Roman elite coordination was restored. Aurelian's reconquest of both Palmyra and Gaul in the early 270s demonstrated that the provincial breakaways had not fundamentally undermined Roman military capacity. What had enabled the secessions was not provincial strength but central weakness. When central weakness was addressed through restored elite coordination, reconquest became possible.

Fifth, both cases show that elite continuity persisted despite formal political changes. When Aurelian reconquered the Gallic Empire, he did not present it as victory over a foreign enemy but rather as restoration of unity. Many officials who had served in the Gallic Empire's administration continued their careers under Roman authority, including Tetricus himself, who was appointed to an administrative post in Italy. This pattern of elite continuity despite regime change mirrors findings from the Haiti, Russia, and decolonization case studies.

The provincial secessions during the Third Century Crisis thus validate a core claim of the Chaos Thesis: what appears to be revolutionary or secessionist success is often primarily a function of elite dysfunction rather than revolutionary strength. Gallic and Palmyrene independence lasted precisely as long as Roman elite remained too fragmented to respond effectively. When elite coordination was restored, independence ended rapidly.

PART III: THE BAGAUDAE AND POPULAR REBELLION

The Character of Rural Insurgency

While the Gallic and Palmyrene empires represented elite-led secessions that maintained existing social structures, the Bagaudae rebellions in Gaul and later Hispania represented a different phenomenon: popular insurgency from below. The Bagaudae emerged during the late third century as armed bands of rural poor, military deserters, escaped slaves, and dispossessed peasants who challenged both imperial authority and local aristocratic power. Their name, derived from a Celtic root meaning "fighters" or "warriors," reflected their self-identification as a militant force resisting exploitation.

The earliest documented Bagaudae uprising occurred around 284-285 CE under leaders named Amandus and Aelianus (or Elianus). Contemporary Roman sources describe them as peasants in Gaul who formed armed bands to resist taxation, raid wealthy estates, and challenge imperial control. The third-century Panegyric of Maximian, delivered around 289 CE and attributed to Claudius Mamertinus, provides revealing details about how Roman elites perceived these insurgents. Mamertinus describes how "simple farmers sought military garb; the plowman imitated the infantryman, the shepherd the cavalryman, the rustic harvester of his own crops the barbarian enemy." He calls them "two-shaped monsters," emphasizing that while technically imperial subjects and citizens, they had become enemies of the empire.

This characterization reveals both the threat the Bagaudae posed and the social conditions that produced them. These were not foreign invaders or professional revolutionaries but rather Roman provincials who had been driven to armed resistance. The transformation of farmers into fighters, of shepherds into cavalry, represented a fundamental breakdown in the social order. That Roman subjects would model themselves after "barbarian enemies" indicated both desperation and a complete loss of faith in imperial protection.

The timing of the Bagaudae emergence is crucial. They arose precisely during the period of maximum elite chaos, when Germanic invasions had devastated Gaul and Persian victories in the East had demonstrated Roman military weakness. The Crisis of the Third Century had imposed crushing fiscal demands on provincial populations. Emperors fighting constant civil wars needed funds to pay their troops, leading to aggressive taxation and currency debasement that produced severe inflation. Provincial administrators, lacking clear direction from a fragmented central authority and facing their own resource constraints, often resorted to coercive tax collection methods.

Simultaneously, Germanic invasions ravaged the Gallic countryside. The Alamanni, Franks, and other tribes raided agricultural regions, destroying infrastructure, displacing populations, and undermining the economic base that sustained both provincial life and tax revenues. Imperial forces, scattered across multiple civil war fronts, could not provide consistent defense. Provincial populations found themselves trapped between extractive taxation demanded by a government that could not protect them and barbarian raids that destroyed their livelihoods.

In this context, the Bagaudae represented a form of social breakdown and armed resistance that would have been suppressed quickly under normal conditions. Roman military capacity had always been sufficient to crush peasant rebellions when that capacity could be concentrated and deployed effectively. What made the late third-century Bagaudae possible was precisely the inability of fragmented Roman authority to coordinate systematic suppression.

Suppression and Recurrence

The pattern of Bagaudae suppression validates the Chaos Thesis as clearly as the pattern of provincial secession. When Diocletian established the Tetrarchy in 293 CE and restored a degree of elite coordination, one of his first actions was to deploy military force against the Bagaudae. In 286 CE, the co-Caesar Maximian crushed the peasant insurgents with swift and severe force. The leaders Amandus and Aelianus were captured or killed, and organized resistance was broken.

This rapid suppression demonstrates that the Bagaudae had succeeded temporarily not because they were militarily strong or well-organized but because Roman authority had been too fragmented to respond effectively. The moment elite coordination was restored, even partially, the violence monopoly could be deployed against rural insurgents with devastating effectiveness. The Bagaudae disappeared as an organized force not because their grievances had been addressed or because their military capacity had been exhausted, but because the

structural conditions that had enabled their emergence—elite chaos and violence monopoly fragmentation—had been reduced.

However, the Bagaudae pattern did not end with Diocletian's suppression. The insurgencies recurred throughout the fourth and fifth centuries whenever Roman authority weakened or provincial conditions deteriorated. This cyclical pattern is revealing. During periods of relative imperial stability and elite coordination, the Bagaudae disappeared. During periods of crisis, invasion, or civil war, they reemerged. The variable determining their success or suppression was consistently the degree of elite chaos and the availability of the violence monopoly for internal suppression.

In the early fifth century, Bagaudae rebellions resurged in Armorica (Brittany) around 407-417 CE, coinciding with major Germanic invasions of Gaul. The population of Gallia Lugdunensis, suffering enormously from invasions, formed armed groups for self-protection when the usurper Constantine III failed to provide defense. These groups, called Bagaudae in the sources, came to dominate significant territories including parts of Aquitania and multiple provinces of Lugdunensis. The rebellion continued for years because imperial forces were engaged in civil wars and Gothic invasions, unable to concentrate forces against internal insurgents.

The Roman general Flavius Aetius eventually suppressed this Bagaudae uprising using federate forces, including Alans under their king Goar. However, the rebellions recurred again under a leader named Tibatto in the late 430s and early 440s. Tibatto was captured in 437 but escaped and led the Bagaudae again in 442. The fact that he was not immediately executed and managed to escape suggests possible collusion by his captors—an indication that even suppression was incomplete when imperial authority was weak.

In Hispania, Bagaudae appeared in the mid-fifth century in western Tarraconensis, attacking great estates of landowners and ecclesiastical properties. Notably, the Suevic king Rechiar allied with local Bagaudae in ravaging remaining Roman cities—a unique alliance between Germanic ruler and rebel peasants that demonstrated how thoroughly imperial authority had broken down in some regions.

The Nature of Popular Insurgency

The Bagaudae rebellions reveal several important patterns about popular insurgency during elite chaos. First, these were not ideologically coherent revolutionary movements with clear programmatic goals. Roman sources describe them variously as brigands, deserters' bands, and peasant insurgents. Modern historians have debated their character, with some emphasizing class warfare and others characterizing them primarily as banditry. The reality appears to have been that the Bagaudae combined elements of both—armed resistance to exploitation and opportunistic raiding, organized insurgency and desperate survival strategies.

Second, the Bagaudae never successfully established lasting alternative political structures despite temporary territorial control. They declared their own emperors and minted coins during some uprisings, but these actions represented symbolic rejection of Roman authority rather than

creation of viable competing governance systems. Unlike the Gallic and Palmyrene empires, which maintained sophisticated administrative structures, the Bagaudae operated primarily as armed bands engaged in resistance and plunder.

Third, the Bagaudae failed to develop sustained political organization or group identity beyond immediate tactical cooperation. They formed larger groups when facing danger but dispersed otherwise. This organizational weakness, characteristic of peasant rebellions throughout history, meant they could never consolidate territorial gains or build institutions capable of replacing Roman administration.

Fourth, the Bagaudae were systematically crushed whenever imperial forces could concentrate against them. Every major Bagaudae uprising ended in suppression when Roman military capacity became available. The rebellions succeeded temporarily only when elite chaos prevented coordinated response. This pattern held across two centuries—suppression during periods of elite coordination, resurgence during periods of elite fragmentation.

Fifth, despite their failures to achieve lasting political transformation, the Bagaudae represented genuine threats that required substantial military effort to suppress. The fact that Roman generals had to deploy significant forces, including barbarian federates, against them indicates they were not merely bandit gangs but rather armed insurgencies of considerable scale. Their repeated resurgence over two centuries suggests deep structural problems in late Roman rural society that military suppression could not resolve.

The Bagaudae thus demonstrate the limits of popular insurgency in the absence of either elite sponsorship or sufficient elite chaos to prevent systematic suppression. Unlike Haiti or Russia, where elite chaos coincided with foreign intervention that provided resources and protection to revolutionary movements, the Bagaudae received no significant external support. Unlike the Gallic and Palmyrene empires, which were led by provincial elites who could maintain administrative structures and command professional military forces, the Bagaudae leadership came from the underclass and lacked capacity for sophisticated governance.

The result was predictable: temporary success during maximum elite chaos, followed by systematic suppression when elite coordination was restored. The Bagaudae achieved no lasting political transformation, established no enduring alternative governance, and were ultimately crushed or absorbed repeatedly across centuries. Their story validates a core claim of the Chaos Thesis: popular mobilization alone, without either elite sponsorship or such severe elite chaos that systematic suppression becomes impossible, typically fails to produce revolutionary success.

PART IV: RESTORATION AND RECONQUEST

Aurelian and the Reconsolidation of Power

The turning point in the Third Century Crisis came with the reign of Aurelian from 270 to 275 CE. Unlike many of his immediate predecessors, Aurelian managed to establish sufficient control over Roman military forces to pursue a systematic program of territorial reconquest and defensive stabilization. His success demonstrates how restoration of even partial elite coordination dramatically altered the balance of power between the fragmenting empire and its breakaway provinces.

Aurelian's first major achievement was defeating various barbarian invasions that had penetrated into imperial territory. He drove back the Alamanni, Vandals, and Goths through a series of campaigns that demonstrated Roman military capacity had not been fundamentally destroyed despite decades of civil war. What had been lacking was not military strength but rather the coordination necessary to deploy that strength effectively. With a single emperor commanding loyal forces and able to concentrate them against specific threats, the military balance shifted decisively.

Having secured the frontiers to some degree, Aurelian turned to reconquering the breakaway empires. His campaign against the Palmyrene Empire in 272 CE was swift and decisive. After defeating Zenobia's forces at Immae and Emesa, he besieged Palmyra and forced its surrender. When the city rebelled the following year, he razed it completely. This demonstrated not only restored military capacity but also willingness to use severe measures against provincial secession.

The reconquest of the Gallic Empire in 274 CE followed a similar pattern. Aurelian marched against Tetricus I and defeated him at the Battle of Châlons. Some sources suggest Tetricus offered to surrender before the battle in exchange for clemency for himself and his son, though this may have been later propaganda. Regardless, Aurelian's victory was decisive, and the Gallic provinces were reintegrated into the empire.

Significantly, Aurelian did not treat the Gallic reconquest as victory over a foreign enemy. Many officials who had served in the Gallic Empire's administration continued their careers under Roman authority. Tetricus himself was appointed to an administrative position in Italy. This approach reflected pragmatic recognition that the Gallic Empire had been a Roman political entity, not a foreign power, and that reintegration required accommodating provincial elites who had supported it.

Aurelian's military successes earned him the title "Restitutor Orbis"—Restorer of the World. The title was not mere propaganda. He had genuinely reconstituted the Roman Empire as a single political entity after nearly fifteen years of fragmentation into competing states. This achievement was possible not because the breakaway empires had weakened but because Aurelian had restored sufficient elite coordination to deploy the violence monopoly effectively.

However, Aurelian's assassination in 275 CE demonstrated that the underlying problems that had produced the Crisis had not been fully resolved. The right of succession remained unclear, military loyalty remained conditional on continued satisfaction with pay and booty, and the fiscal crisis that had driven currency debasement and inflation persisted. Aurelian had addressed the

symptoms of elite fragmentation through personal leadership and military success, but he had not fundamentally reformed the structures that produced fragmentation.

Diocletian's Systematic Reforms

The actual end of the Third Century Crisis required more than military reconquest. It required systematic institutional reforms that addressed the structural causes of elite fragmentation. These reforms were implemented by Diocletian, who ruled from 284 to 305 CE and fundamentally restructured the Roman imperial system.

Diocletian recognized that the empire's size and the multiplicity of threats it faced made it impossible for a single autocratic ruler to effectively manage all challenges simultaneously. His solution was the Tetrarchy—a system of four co-emperors designed to provide multiple centers of authority while maintaining overall coordination. Two senior emperors (Augusti) would each appoint a junior partner (Caesar) who would both assist in governance and provide a designated successor. This system aimed to address the succession crisis that had produced constant civil wars while distributing administrative and military responsibilities across multiple capable leaders.

The Tetrarchy also involved significant administrative reforms. Diocletian increased the number of provinces and reduced their individual size, making it more difficult for provincial governors to build independent power bases. He separated civilian administration from military command to reduce the risk of generals using their positions to launch imperial bids. He reorganized the military to include mobile field armies that could respond quickly to threats rather than being tied to fixed frontier positions.

Diocletian's fiscal reforms attempted to stabilize the economy after decades of inflation and currency debasement. He issued a new coinage with restored precious metal content and attempted to control prices through the Edict on Maximum Prices, though this proved largely unenforceable. He reformed taxation systems to make revenue collection more predictable and efficient. These economic measures had mixed success, but they represented serious attempts to address the fiscal foundations of imperial power.

Crucially for this analysis, Diocletian's restored elite coordination enabled systematic suppression of internal challenges. The crushing of the Bagaudae in 286 CE by Maximian demonstrated that peasant rebellions could be suppressed quickly when the violence monopoly was available and coordinated. No successful provincial secessions emerged during Diocletian's reign because the structural conditions that had enabled such secessions—elite chaos and violence monopoly fragmentation—had been significantly reduced.

The Tetrarchy ultimately failed as a succession system. After Diocletian's abdication in 305 CE, civil wars resumed, leading eventually to Constantine's emergence as sole emperor in 324 CE. However, the Tetrarchy's failure as a succession mechanism should not obscure its success in ending the Third Century Crisis. By 285 CE, the empire had emerged from military anarchy into a new period of stability. The fundamental administrative, military, and fiscal reforms

implemented by Diocletian and developed by Constantine transformed the Roman Empire into what historians call the Late Roman Empire or the Dominate—a different kind of state adapted to changed circumstances.

The Transformation of Imperial Power

The Roman Empire that emerged from the Third Century Crisis was fundamentally different from the empire that had entered it. The facade of republican institutions that had persisted through the Principate was abandoned in favor of explicitly autocratic rule. The emperor no longer maintained the fiction of being merely the "first citizen" but rather openly claimed absolute authority. Court ceremony became more elaborate and borrowed heavily from Persian models, emphasizing the emperor's sacred and absolute status.

The military was reorganized into frontier troops (limitanei) stationed permanently in border regions and mobile field armies (comitatenses) that could respond to invasions or rebellions wherever they occurred. This system was more flexible than the purely frontier-based deployment of the High Empire but also more expensive and required larger forces. The size of the army increased substantially, with estimates suggesting it roughly doubled between the second and fourth centuries.

The administrative system became more centralized and bureaucratic. Provincial divisions were multiplied, reducing the power of individual governors. Dioceses were created as intermediate administrative levels between provinces and the imperial court. The separation of civil and military authority meant that provincial governors no longer commanded troops, reducing their capacity for rebellion but also limiting their effectiveness in crisis situations.

Economic and social structures became more rigid. The colonate system increasingly tied peasants to the land they worked, making their status and location hereditary. Urban craftsmen and merchants found their occupations becoming hereditary and their movement restricted. These measures were intended to ensure stable tax bases and maintain essential economic functions, but they also represented a more coercive and less flexible society than the High Empire had been.

The changes represented adaptation to new realities. The empire could no longer expand territorially to gain resources through conquest. It faced more organized and aggressive enemies on multiple frontiers. The fiscal base had been weakened by prolonged crisis. The political culture had shifted toward military authoritarianism. The Late Roman Empire was designed to survive in this harsher environment through greater centralization, more explicit coercion, and systematic mobilization of resources.

What is crucial for this analysis is that these transformations were responses to the Crisis and the elite fragmentation it represented. The Tetrarchy, administrative reforms, military reorganization, and social rigidification were all attempts to prevent the recurrence of the conditions that had nearly destroyed the empire. They aimed to reduce elite competition for imperial power, concentrate authority effectively, deploy military force strategically, and ensure

stable revenues. The success of these reforms in ending the Crisis and providing over a century of relative stability in the East (and several more decades in the West) demonstrates that the Crisis was fundamentally about elite coordination, not about some inevitable decline or external conquest.

PART V: VALIDATION OF THE CHAOS THESIS

The Third Century Crisis as Natural Experiment

The Third Century Crisis provides what amounts to a natural experiment in revolutionary and secessionist causation. The Roman Empire represents a single political system observed across two distinct periods: before 235 CE when elite coordination functioned effectively, and 235-284 CE when elite fragmentation produced chaos. The provinces, populations, economic conditions, and external threats remained broadly similar. What changed was the degree of elite cohesion and the capacity for coordinated deployment of the violence monopoly.

This experimental structure allows clear identification of the causal variable. During the period of elite coordination, provincial uprisings were rare and those that occurred were systematically suppressed. The Jewish revolts of 66-73 CE and 132-135 CE, despite involving highly motivated populations and organized resistance, were crushed through concentrated military force. The Batavian revolt of 69-70 CE succeeded temporarily during a civil war year but was suppressed once elite conflict resolved. The pattern was consistent: coordinated elite authority using functional violence monopolies suppressed challenges regardless of their apparent strength or justification.

The Third Century Crisis represents removal of the causal variable—elite coordination. Everything else remained broadly constant. Roman military forces were not weaker in absolute terms than they had been in the second century. Provincial populations were not more oppressed than they had been under previous emperors. Economic conditions, while deteriorating, were not uniformly worse than conditions that had previously existed without producing fragmentation. What changed was elite cohesion and the capacity to deploy the violence monopoly in coordinated fashion.

The results of this natural experiment validate the Chaos Thesis precisely. When elite fragmentation occurred, provinces that had been successfully governed for centuries suddenly achieved successful secession. Peasant populations that had been controlled for generations suddenly mounted armed rebellions. Not because provinces had become stronger or peasants more revolutionary, but because elite chaos created opportunities that had not existed before.

Equally important, the restoration of elite coordination under Aurelian and Diocletian enabled rapid reconquest and suppression. The same provinces that had successfully seceded were reintegrated within a few years once coordinated force could be deployed. The same peasant

rebellions that had controlled significant territories were crushed systematically once the violence monopoly became available. The variable determining success or failure was consistently elite cohesion, not revolutionary strength.

Parallels to Modern Revolutionary Periods

The Third Century Crisis parallels the modern revolutionary periods examined in previous case studies in several crucial respects. Like Latin American independence following the Napoleonic Wars, the Gallic and Palmyrene empires succeeded because metropolitan elite were consumed by internal conflicts and external wars that disabled their capacity for colonial control. Like decolonization following World War II, provincial secessions occurred not because colonies had become stronger but because metropolitan powers had been exhausted by total war.

The pattern of elite continuity also parallels modern cases. Just as Latin American independence saw power transfer from peninsulares to creoles while maintaining property relations and social hierarchies, the Gallic and Palmyrene empires represented elite power transitions rather than social revolutions. Postumus was a Roman governor who became a Roman emperor of a breakaway Roman state. Zenobia was Palmyrene royalty exercising power within Roman political frameworks. Both maintained existing social structures and elite privileges.

The Bagaudae rebellions parallel popular mobilizations that failed to achieve lasting transformation without elite sponsorship or sufficient elite chaos to prevent suppression. Like peasant rebellions throughout history, the Bagaudae could mount armed resistance and control territory temporarily but could not build the administrative capacity or military organization necessary to establish viable alternative governance. Like most failed revolutionary movements, they were crushed when coordinated force became available.

The Third Century Crisis also demonstrates the pattern of foreign intervention or exploitation of rival elite conflicts. Germanic tribes and Sassanid Persians exploited Roman elite chaos to achieve victories that would have been impossible against a coordinated empire. Like foreign powers supporting revolutionary movements in Haiti and Russia, external enemies provided pressure that deepened the crisis and reduced the resources available for internal suppression.

However, there are also significant differences from modern cases that illuminate the boundaries of the Chaos Thesis. The Third Century Crisis did not involve total war in the twentieth-century sense. While destructive, the civil wars and barbarian invasions did not produce the complete societal mobilization and resource exhaustion that characterized the Napoleonic Wars, World War I, or World War II. The degree of elite fragmentation, while severe, was not as complete as the collapse of the French state during the Revolutionary Wars or the Russian state during World War I.

Correspondingly, the provincial secessions were less enduring and the popular rebellions less successful than modern revolutionary movements that benefited from more complete metropolitan chaos. The Gallic Empire lasted fourteen years, Palmyra five years—substantial

periods but far shorter than successful modern revolutionary states. The Bagaudae never established lasting governance at all. This suggests a possible correlation between the degree of elite chaos and the potential duration and completeness of revolutionary success.

The Role of Economic Conditions

The Third Century Crisis also illuminates the role of economic conditions in revolutionary causation. The period saw severe economic disruption—currency debasement, inflation, trade network breakdown, agricultural decline in affected regions, and fiscal crisis. These conditions created genuine hardship for provincial populations and certainly contributed to both elite fragmentation and popular rebellion.

However, economic crisis alone did not determine outcomes. The crisis began in 235 CE but the empire did not immediately fragment. The Gallic and Palmyrene empires emerged in 260 and 267 CE respectively, a quarter-century after the initial breakdown of elite coordination. The Bagaudae appeared in the 280s. This timing suggests economic crisis was not sufficient by itself to produce fragmentation but rather created conditions that became revolutionary only when combined with elite chaos.

Moreover, economic conditions did not immediately improve when elite coordination was restored. Inflation persisted, the currency remained debased, trade networks were disrupted, and fiscal problems continued. Yet Aurelian successfully reconquered the breakaway empires despite these ongoing economic difficulties. Diocletian's reforms provided some economic stabilization but did not immediately resolve the fundamental fiscal crisis. The critical variable enabling reconquest and suppression was elite coordination and violence monopoly deployment, not economic recovery.

This pattern mirrors findings from other case studies. The 1848 revolutions occurred during the worst economic crisis of the nineteenth century but failed completely because European elites were not exhausted by total war and could coordinate suppression. Conversely, decolonization succeeded despite varied economic conditions in different colonies because metropolitan powers had been exhausted by World War II.

Economic conditions matter as a necessary but insufficient factor. They create grievances that can motivate popular mobilization and strain elite resources. Severe economic crisis can contribute to elite fragmentation by intensifying competition for scarce resources. But economic crisis alone does not produce revolutionary success. The critical variable is whether elite can coordinate suppression despite economic difficulties, which depends primarily on the degree of elite cohesion and violence monopoly functionality.

The Limits of Popular Agency

Perhaps the most uncomfortable implication of the Third Century Crisis for revolutionary theory is what it reveals about the limits of popular agency. The Bagaudae represented genuine popular resistance motivated by authentic grievances. They mobilized thousands of rural poor,

challenged both imperial authority and aristocratic power, controlled significant territories temporarily, and required substantial military effort to suppress. By many measures, they were a significant popular movement.

Yet they achieved no lasting political transformation. Every Bagaudae uprising was eventually suppressed. They established no enduring alternative governance. They did not fundamentally alter social relations in the regions where they operated. When the Western Roman Empire eventually collapsed in the fifth century, it was to Germanic kingdoms, not to movements descended from the Bagaudae.

The critical factor limiting Bagaudae success was not their courage, commitment, or even their military capacity in any absolute sense. It was the structural reality that whenever Roman elite could coordinate the violence monopoly against them, they were crushed. During brief windows when elite chaos prevented such coordination, the Bagaudae could operate successfully. When coordination was restored, they were systematically destroyed.

This pattern validates the Chaos Thesis claim that popular mobilization is necessary but insufficient for revolutionary success. The oppressed do not liberate themselves through will and organization alone. They require structural conditions—specifically elite fragmentation and violence monopoly dysfunction—that are typically beyond their control to create. The Bagaudae demonstrated remarkable persistence, repeatedly resurging across two centuries. But persistence without elite sponsorship or sufficient elite chaos to prevent suppression produces repeated defeat, not revolutionary transformation.

The Gallic and Palmyrene empires succeeded longer not because they represented superior forms of resistance but because they were led by provincial elites who could maintain administrative structures and command professional military forces. Even these elite-led secessions failed once metropolitan elite coordination was restored. Popular movements without elite leadership or sponsorship faced even more severe structural constraints.

Theoretical Implications

The Third Century Crisis thus provides strong validation for the Chaos Thesis across multiple dimensions. It demonstrates that:

First, elite fragmentation creates opportunities for both provincial secession and popular rebellion that do not exist under conditions of elite coordination. The same provinces successfully governed for centuries achieved independence during elite chaos. The same populations controlled for generations mounted armed rebellions during elite fragmentation.

Second, restoration of elite coordination enables rapid reconquest and suppression regardless of revolutionary movement strength or organization. Provinces that had maintained independence for years or decades were reconquered within months once coordinated force could be deployed. Rebellions that had controlled significant territories were crushed systematically once the violence monopoly became available for suppression.

Third, economic conditions and popular grievances are necessary but insufficient factors in revolutionary causation. Severe crisis and authentic suffering motivated both elite secessions and popular rebellions, but success depended on elite fragmentation, not grievance severity.

Fourth, revolutionary and secessionist outcomes typically involve elite continuity rather than fundamental social transformation. The Gallic and Palmyrene empires maintained existing social structures under new political leadership. Even when metropolitan authority was restored, provincial elites who had served breakaway regimes often continued their careers. The Bagaudae, despite representing genuine popular resistance, achieved no lasting transformation of social relations.

Fifth, the pattern of success correlating with elite chaos and failure correlating with elite coordination holds across different types of challenges—elite-led provincial secessions, popular peasant rebellions, and external barbarian invasions. The common variable is not the character of the challenge but the degree of elite fragmentation in the targeted state.

These findings align precisely with predictions of the Chaos Thesis and contradict alternative theories that emphasize economic determinism, popular consciousness, or revolutionary organization as primary causal factors. The Third Century Crisis provides historical validation for the uncomfortable truth that revolutionary success depends substantially on elite dysfunction rather than revolutionary quality.

CONCLUSION: THE ETERNAL CITY'S TEMPORARY FRACTURE

The Third Century Crisis represents one of the most dramatic demonstrations in historical record of how elite fragmentation enables challenges to authority that would be impossible under normal conditions, and how restoration of elite coordination enables systematic suppression regardless of challenge strength. For fifty years, the Roman Empire—which had maintained territorial integrity and elite coordination for centuries—splintered into competing states, faced successful provincial secessions, and experienced popular rebellions that controlled significant territories. Then, within a decade of restored elite coordination under Aurelian and Diocletian, the empire was reconstituted, the breakaway provinces reconquered, and the rebellions crushed.

The pattern is too clear to attribute to coincidence or to factors other than elite coordination. The provinces did not suddenly become weaker when Aurelian reconquered them. The Bagaudae did not suddenly lose their grievances or commitment when Maximian suppressed them. External enemies did not suddenly become less threatening when Diocletian reformed the frontiers. What changed was elite cohesion and the capacity to deploy the violence monopoly in coordinated fashion.

This natural experiment in revolutionary causation validates the core claims of the Chaos Thesis while also revealing its boundaries. Elite chaos creates opportunities for challenges that otherwise would be suppressed systematically. But the degree of chaos matters. The Third Century Crisis produced severe elite fragmentation but not complete state collapse. Correspondingly, it enabled provincial secessions that lasted years or decades but not centuries, and popular rebellions that controlled territories temporarily but never established lasting alternative governance.

The comparison to twentieth-century revolutionary periods is instructive. The Napoleonic Wars, World War I, and World War II produced more complete metropolitan exhaustion and state collapse than the Third Century Crisis civil wars. Correspondingly, they enabled more enduring revolutionary transformations—Latin American independence, the Soviet state, decolonization. The Third Century Crisis produced temporary fragmentations that were reversed once elite coordination was restored.

Yet even temporary fragmentations reveal fundamental truths about power and revolutionary possibility. The Gallic Empire's fourteen years, Palmyra's five years, and the Bagaudae's recurring insurgencies all demonstrate that elite coordination is the critical variable determining success or failure of challenges to authority. When that coordination collapses, opportunities emerge. When it is restored, challenges are suppressed.

For contemporary understanding of revolutionary dynamics, the Third Century Crisis offers several lessons. It demonstrates that oppression and economic crisis, while creating grievances and motivating resistance, do not by themselves produce revolutionary success. It shows that popular mobilization, while necessary for revolutionary movements, is insufficient without either elite sponsorship or such severe elite chaos that systematic suppression becomes impossible. It reveals that even successful challenges to authority during elite chaos typically involve elite continuity and power transitions rather than fundamental social transformation.

Most fundamentally, the Third Century Crisis validates the uncomfortable truth at the heart of the Chaos Thesis: revolutionary success is substantially a function of elite dysfunction rather than revolutionary quality. The provinces that seceded from Rome were not objectively stronger than provinces that had remained loyal for centuries. The Bagaudae were not more capable than peasant populations that had been controlled for generations. What changed was the capacity of elite to coordinate suppression, not the capacity of revolutionaries to resist.

This recognition does not diminish the courage or significance of those who challenged Roman authority. The Bagaudae demonstrated remarkable persistence across two centuries. Provincial populations supported breakaway empires despite risks. These were genuine acts of resistance motivated by authentic grievances. But structural conditions—specifically elite cohesion and violence monopoly functionality—determined whether resistance produced temporary success or immediate suppression, lasting transformation or rapid reconquest.

The Third Century Crisis thus stands as one of the clearest historical validations of the Chaos Thesis. It demonstrates with exceptional clarity how elite fragmentation enables revolutionary

and secessionist success, and how elite coordination enables systematic suppression. The pattern is universal, the mechanism is clear, and the implications are profound for understanding both historical transformations and contemporary politics. The eternal city's temporary fracture reveals eternal truths about how power actually works and how it can, under specific structural conditions, be successfully challenged.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

*This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations**